

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                                    | FI   | LING DATE  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/076,666   | (    | 02/14/2002 | Huy M. Nguyen        | RB1-041US           | 1711            |
| 29150  | 7590 | 11/18/2004 |                      | EXAMINER            |                 |
| LEE & HAYES, PLLC<br>421 W. RIVERSIDE AVE, STE 500 |      |            |                      | CUNNINGHAM, TERRY   |                 |
| SPOKANE, WA 99201                                  |      | •          |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |
| -  |      |            |                      | 2816                |                 |

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 10/076,666   | NGUYEN ET AL.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| riation, riodon   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Terry D. Cunningham  | 2816  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apper Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | void abandonment of this appliced the substitution of the substitu | cation. A proper rep                                    | oly to a                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 700.07(9)   | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the<br>an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of   | the final rejection.                                    |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in  | fee. The appropriate ext<br>the final Office action: or | ension fee under<br>(2) as set forth in |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF   | s Brief must be filed within the p<br>R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o  | period set forth in of the appeal.                      |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b  | ecause:  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a)   they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (   | see NOTE below);  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by   | pelow);  | •   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or  | n better form for appeal by mat  | erially reducing or s                                   | simplifying the                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:   | ing a corresponding number of  | finally rejected clair                                  | ns.                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection   | tion(s):   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | · · · ——   | eparate, timely filed                                   | d amendment                             |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See   | r reconsideration has been cons  | idered but does NC                                      | OT place the                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |  | to issues which we                                      | re newly                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   | c(s) a)☐ will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided belo   | )□ will be entered<br>ow or appended.                   | and an                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | , ,   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>33-42,47 and 54</u> .  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   | ,  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-32,43-46,48-53 and 55-73</u> .  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app  | roved or b)  disapproved by  | the Examiner.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement</li> </ol>  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | ·   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  | Terry D. Cunningha<br>Primary Examiner                  | m                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Art Unit: 2816  |   |  |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to the issue of motivation, such has been more than sufficiently shown in the record of the case. Reference is made thereto. Further, contrary to Applicant's remarks, the connecting lines discussed in the rejection which provide the "distribute voltages" inherently have impedance charateristics. This effective impedance will have the "compensated voltage" connected to one end thereof. Thus, it is necessarily true that the voltage provided by these lines "degraded relative to the compensated voltage".